

REMARKS

## I. INTRODUCTION

In response to the Office Action dated November 22, 2010, claim 7 has been amended. Claims 7-11 remain in the application. Entry of these amendments, and re-consideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

## II. CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Applicant's attorney has made amendments to the claims as indicated above. Unless otherwise indicated, these amendments were made solely for the purpose of clarifying the language of the claims, and were not required for patentability or to distinguish the claims over the prior art.

## III. PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

In paragraph (2) of the Office Action, claims 7-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious in view of the combination of Vancelette, U.S. Patent 5,894,320 (Vancelette) and Rainville et al., U.S. Publication 2002/0069411 (Rainville).

Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The Vancelette Reference

Vancelette describes a multi-channel television system with viewer selectable video and audio. Specifically, Vancelette teaches an out-of-band packetized data stream that is out of the band used for transmission of the data packets (see Col. 8, lines 46-58), and a demodulator that demodulates both in-band data streams and out-of-band data streams (see Col. 8, lines 66-67). In response to both the code data packets (out-of-band data) and packetized data stream (in-band data) the processor creates a graphical display to show the options available (see Col. 9, lines 54-65).

The Rainville Reference

Rainville is cited as teaching transparent indicia.

### The Claims Are Patentable Over The Cited References

The claims describe a user interface for selecting from and viewing a plurality of video images each representing a unique camera angle captured by one or more cameras at an event at a given venue. An interface in accordance with one or more claimed embodiments comprises software for providing all of the plurality of video images and data including on-screen indicia to facilitate navigation between the plurality of video images to a receiver as a single bundled video image, the on-screen indicia comprising a transparent bar, a display of navigation keys to provide directional navigation instructions, and a textual description of a video image currently being viewed, and video image selection means for selecting one of the received video images from the plurality of received video images, the video image selection means being presented throughout the event, such that selecting a particular video image from the plurality of video images received at the receiver directly changes from the current video image to the particular video image angle at the time of selecting the particular video image.

The cited references do not teach or suggest the limitations of the claims. Specifically, the cited references do not teach or suggest at least the limitation of providing all of the plurality of video images and data including on-screen indicia to facilitate navigation between the plurality of video images to a receiver as a single bundled video image as recited in the claims.

### Discussion

The Office Action has abandoned the rejections based on Freeman, and now cites Vancelette as teaching the bulk of the claims. Applicants traverse the characterization of Vancelette.

Vancelette teaches that the on-screen indicia (the code-data packets in Vancelette) are transmitted as a separate out-of-band signal, while the video data is transmitted as an in-band signal (see Vancelette Cols. 8-9). These signals are then processed separately at the processor which processes both in-band and out-of-band signals in Vancelette and then **combined by the receiver to produce the final image** (see Col. 9, lines 54-65). As such, Vancelette does not teach or suggest providing all of the plurality of video images and data including on-screen indicia as a bundled video image as recited by the claims.

To expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended the claim to recite that the plurality of video images and the on-screen indicia are provided to the receiver as a single bundled video image, which is not taught or suggested by Vancelette. Vancelette instead teaches that a plurality of video images are transmitted together, and the on-screen indicia (the code-data packets) are transmitted as

a separate out-of-band signal, and thus are not bundled with the video images in Vancelette. The ancillary Rainville reference does not remedy Vancelette's deficiency, and thus the claims are patentable over all of the cited references, alone or in any combination.

The amendments and arguments presented herein are supported by the specification in paragraphs [0006], [0033] – [0035], and in the preliminary amendment filed December 8, 2003, on at least pages 2-4.

The various elements of Applicant's claims together provide operational advantages over the systems disclosed in Vancelette and Rainville. In addition, Applicant's claimed system solves problems not recognized by Vancelette and Rainville.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is submitted that this application is now in good order for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner believe minor matters remain that can be resolved in a telephone interview, the Examiner is urged to call Applicant's undersigned attorney.

The Director is authorized to charge Applicant's Deposit Account No. 50-0383 should any fees not accounted for become due with this paper.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 17, 2011

  
Todd N. Snyder, Registration No. 41,320  
Attorney for Applicant

The DIRECTV Group, Inc.  
CA / LA1 / A109  
2230 E. Imperial Highway  
El Segundo, CA 90245

Telephone No.: (310) 964-0560